

CHAPTER 5

MANDATORY CEQA SECTIONS:

CONSEQUENCES OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

This Chapter contains required discussions and analysis of various issues mandated by CEQA. Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible new significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires that an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. In addition, CEQA requires assessment of significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented, growth-inducing impacts, and irreversible environmental changes and irretrievable commitment of resources. This section will discuss the following topics specifically related to this project:

- 5.1 Effects Not Found to be Significant
- 5.2 Unavoidable Impacts
- 5.3 Irreversible Impacts
- 5.4 Cumulative Impacts
- 5.5 Growth-Inducing Impacts

5.1 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

As noted above, Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons why various possible new significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. For this project, those effects were determined based on initial analysis in the Initial Study/Environmental Checklist, the discussion contained in the Notice of Preparation, and the evaluation of impacts undertaken as part of this EIR process. Effects of this project not found to be significant are presented in this section.

- Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project.
- Disruption or division of the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community).
- Displacement of existing housing, especially affordable housing.
- The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features.
- Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements.

- Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater.
- Creation of objectionable odors.
- Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site.
- Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.
- Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).
- Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts.
- Impacts to important spawning areas for anadromous fish.
- Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.
- Use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.
- The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard.
- A need for or substantial alterations to solid waste materials recovery or disposal.

5.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED

Since the phrase “significant effect on the environment” occupies such a critical role in the preparation and review of an EIR, the following definition, as contained in Section 15382 of the State CEQA Guidelines, is provided for reference:

“Significant effect on the environment” means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project including land, air, water, mineral, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that the EIR describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.

The environmental effects of the proposed FDCP on selected aspects of the environment are discussed in detail in Chapter Three of this EIR. Significant or potentially significant effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed FDCP is approved and development is carried out as proposed

are presented below. Other unavoidable impacts attributable to implementation of the proposed FDCP have either been determined to be less than significant, or are capable of being mitigated to less than significant levels by measures recommended in this EIR.

- **Loss of open space resulting from development in accordance with the FDCP (Impact 3.2-3).** Development of the Plan area in accordance with the proposed FDCP would allow conversion of lands currently in undeveloped open space to residential, commercial, industrial or public uses. While the proposed FDCP will allow for less conversion of open space than the existing (1981) Foresthill General Plan, impacts must be measured in comparison to existing conditions rather than future planned uses. The majority of the Plan area is designated for Public Ownership (53%), Agricultural/Timberland (23%), and Forestry (12.4%). The remaining lands (less than 12%) are designated for Rural Residential (parcel sizes ranging from 2.3 acres to 10 acres), Low and Medium Density Residential, Industrial, Development Reserve, Mixed-Use Areas and Historic Outlying Commercial Areas. Portions of these areas are already developed, and the policies of the FDCP are designed to discourage “leapfrog” development and concentrate development within or near the Core Area of Foresthill. The FDCP includes policies to protect existing agricultural lands, forest and timber resources. Nevertheless, the loss of open space resources through conversion to developed uses represents a significant, unavoidable impact of the proposed FDCP that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- **Provision of adequate fire protection services and facilities to serve the Plan area (Impact 3.4-4).** The Foresthill Fire District has concluded that full buildout of the Plan area will require additional fire stations and facilities and full-time paid fire fighter coverage. A development fee is currently assessed upon new development in the Plan area to support fire protection services. The FDCP includes policies that address this impact. Many of these policies involve working with other agencies, including the Foresthill Fire District. The goals and policies do not address the provision of additional fire stations and converting from a volunteer to a full-time paid fire protection service. Although fees are collected from new development, it is not clear whether these will be adequate to fund new stations, equipment and paid personnel. Although the County has the ability to deny projects that do not provide for adequate fire protection, providing the facilities, equipment and personnel are outside the control of the County and cannot be assured. Therefore, this impact is considered potentially significant, and may not be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.
- **Alteration of views from scenic highways in the Plan area due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP (Impact 3.6-3).** The FDCP designates certain road segments as local scenic highways. Implementation of the FDCP will alter some views from the proposed local scenic highways. The forest vegetation and topography of the Plan area will limit the visibility of new development. The FDCP includes numerous goals and policies on the topic of community design that address the promotion, preservation and enhancement of the forested natural and rural atmosphere of the Plan area by requiring high aesthetic quality in all new development. All new development (including major remodeling and reconstruction) must comply with the Foresthill Community Design Guidelines (which are included in the FDCP), the Placer County Rural Design Guidelines, the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual, and the Placer County Landscape Design Guidelines. All new development must be

designed to be compatible with the scale and character of the area. The gateway and scenic corridors that bring residents and visitors into the area must be protected and enhanced. Compliance with the FDCP goals and policies, the Foresthill Community Design Guidelines, and other Placer County design guidelines will reduce the contribution of development to adverse impacts upon scenic vistas and views from scenic highways in the Plan area. It will assure that new development meets an aesthetic standard and open space retention that is not currently required along these roadway segments in the Plan area. Nevertheless, new development in the Plan area will contribute to long-term changes in views from these scenic highways from rural, forested views to views that encompass a greater level of development. This represents a potentially significant impact. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level, therefore it will remain potentially significant.

- **Water quality in the Plan area may be degraded following site development by the introduction of urban pollutants including vehicle oils and greases, heavy metals on roads, parking lots, and driveways, fertilizers and pesticides used on site landscaping, and toxic compounds released from auto maintenance areas. Construction during wet or dry weather will affect water quality with increased sedimentation, operation and maintenance of construction vehicles, and storage of materials that could release contamination to surface waters (Impact 3.6-8).** Newly planted vegetation and newly paved roadways could result in long-term water quality degradation. The higher daily use of roads and parking areas would contribute vehicle oils and grease to stormwater discharge. In commercial, industrial and mixed use areas, stormwater runoff may convey a wide range of pollutants to receiving waters. Vehicles contribute oil, grease, and metals onto roads and parking lots. Excessive use of fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides on landscaping can also result in leaching of nutrients and toxic compounds into stormwater runoff. Such compounds are soluble and would not, therefore, be removed by the use of detention basins. Uncontrolled, these urban pollutants can directly or indirectly affect aquatic life. High concentrations of toxins in runoff can be lethal to aquatic life; chronic, low levels may enter the food chain, affecting the long-term breeding success of populations and lower reproductive potential. Aquatic and wildlife habitat can also be adversely affected by the accumulation of toxins, which can indirectly affect aquatic and wildlife resources. Direct discharge from developments could occur towards surface waters. Due to the increase in impervious surfaces and traffic trips in the Plan area, a substantial increase in urban pollutants would gradually occur in the watersheds over the life of the FDCP. Given the extent of proposed development and roadway improvements, the overall potential for generation of urban pollutants, and because drainage is ultimately conveyed into a potable water source, this potential for long-term water quality degradation is considered a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures will reduce long-term surface water quality impacts. However, because pollutant levels will not be reduced to pre-development levels, long-term impacts will remain significant and unavoidable.
- **Adverse impacts on riparian habitat in the Plan area due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP (Impact 3.6-17).** Riparian habitats support numerous plant and wildlife species and are considered a sensitive habitat in provisions of the Placer County General Plan. Projects that propose encroachment into these areas must follow the guidelines presented in the Placer County General Plan and may require a Streambed Alteration

Agreement with the CDFG. The proposed FDCP includes Policies 4.A.2-1, 4.A.2-2, 4.A.2-5, 4.A.3-1, 4.A.3-2, 4.A.3-8, 4.A.7-1, 4.A.7-2, and 4.A.7-3, as well as Implementation Measures #3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 that address this impact. Implementation of the policies and implementation measures of the FDCP will reduce potential impacts on riparian habitat in the Plan area. However, because new development will occur that may affect riparian habitat, this impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable. No additional mitigation measures are available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- **Adverse impacts on wildlife movement corridors/deer migration corridors in the Plan area due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP (Impact 3.6-I8).** Wildlife movement corridors are essential to the distribution of wildlife, providing a means of movement throughout ranges that are encroached with human disturbances. Because a majority of the habitats within the Plan area is relatively undisturbed, these areas provide a means for wildlife movement throughout the Plan area. Further development within these areas will fragment this habitat and may result in obstructing this movement corridor. The effect on deer migration and wildlife movement should be analyzed prior to the approval of any proposed development within the Plan area. The analysis should include consultation with the CDFG and local resources agencies to properly evaluate the current wildlife movement and deer migration patterns in the Plan area. The FDCP includes Policies 4.A.1-7, 4.A.3-1, 4.A.3-2, 4.A.3-4, 4.A.3-10 and 4.A.3-11 that address this impact. Implementation of these policies will reduce impacts on wildlife movement corridors/deer migration corridors in the Plan area. However, because new development will occur that may affect wildlife movement corridors, this impact is considered potentially significant and unavoidable. No additional mitigation measures are available that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **New stationary and mobile sources of air pollutants caused by buildout of the proposed FDCP, resulting in increased emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ (Impact 3.8-I).** Upon FDCP buildout, operation of new uses developed in accordance with the proposed Plan would cause increased emissions by generating new motor vehicle trips and by causing additional energy use and operation of other stationary sources of emissions. These are stationary- and area-source emissions that would be produced either directly in the Plan area, or indirectly through increased use of utilities located elsewhere. Motor vehicle use, energy use, and other stationary sources would cause emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ that would contribute to existing violations of state-level and/or federal ambient air quality standards. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP will assist in reducing emissions, development within the Plan area will contribute to regional emissions of these pollutants. Because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone and emissions will exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.
- **Construction activities associated with development under the proposed FDCP, which will cause emissions of dust and contaminants from construction equipment exhaust that may contribute substantially to existing air quality violations or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Impact 3.8-2).** Construction activity often produces high levels of fugitive dust, including PM₁₀ particulate matter. Construction-related fugitive dust is generated primarily by grading activities and heavy equipment travel over temporary roads

on-site. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP and Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rules and Regulations will assist in reducing emissions, because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone, and construction-related emissions may at times exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable.

Notwithstanding these significant unavoidable effects, adoption of the FDCP and rezoning is still proposed to implement the Vision and General Goals formulated by the FDCP Team, which were developed through public meetings and the input of the community.

5.3 IRREVERSIBLE IMPACTS

The following excerpt from Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines defines the nature of this analysis:

Uses of non-renewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area), generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Approval and implementation of the proposed FDCP will commit non-renewable resources during construction and ongoing utility services provided to the Plan area. During construction, the use of energy resources and building materials will essentially be irreversible and irretrievable. Construction will require the commitment of a variety of non-renewable or slowly renewable natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt and metals. Development will result in an increase in regional energy consumption not only during construction, but also relating to lighting, heating and cooling of buildings, and other industrial/manufacturing uses. Fossil fuels are the principal source of energy, and the project will increase consumption of available supplies of petroleum products.

As noted in Chapter Three, degradation of ambient air quality is also an irreversible impact of the proposed FDCP.

5.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts are two or more effects that, when combined, are considerable or compound other environmental effects. Each cumulative impact is determined to have one of the following levels of significance: less than significant, significant, or significant and unavoidable.

Section 15130 of the State CEQA Guidelines calls for the following discussion of the cumulative impacts of a proposed project:

- (a) An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(c). Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.
- (1) As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.
- (2) When the combined cumulative impact associated with the project's incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the EIR shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail in the EIR. A lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting the lead agency's conclusion that the cumulative impact is less than significant.
- (3) An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. A project's contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. The lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.
- (4) An EIR may determine that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact is de minimus and thus is not significant. A de minimus contribution means that the environmental conditions would essentially be the same whether or not the proposed project is implemented.
- (b) The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great a detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impacts. The following elements are necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:
 - (1) Either:
 - (A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or

- (B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or areawide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency;
1. When utilizing a list, as suggested in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), factors to consider when determining whether to include a related project should include the nature of each environmental resource being examined, the location of the project and its type. Location may be important, for example, when water quality impacts are an issue since projects outside the watershed would probably not contribute to a cumulative effect. Project type may be important, for example, when the impact is specialized, such as a particular air pollutant or mode of traffic.
 2. "Probable future projects" may be limited to those projects requiring an agency approval for an application which has been received at the time the notice of preparation is released, unless abandoned by the applicant; projects included in an adopted capital improvements program, general plan, regional transportation plan, or other similar plan; projects included in a summary of projections of projects (or development areas designated) in a general plan or a similar plan; projects anticipated as later phase of a previously approved project (e.g., subdivision); or other public agency projects for which money has been budgeted.
 3. Lead agencies should define the geographic scope of the area affected by the cumulative effect and provide a reasonable explanation for the geographic limitation used.
- (2) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and
- (3) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.
- (c) With some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis.
- (d) Previously approved land use documents such as general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans may be used in cumulative impact analysis. A pertinent discussion of cumulative impacts contained in one or more previously certified EIRs may be incorporated by reference pursuant to the provisions for tiering and

project EIRs. No further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, master or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or areawide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in section 15152(f), in a certified EIR for that plan.

- (e) If a cumulative impact was adequately addressed in a prior EIR for a community plan, zoning action, or general plan, and the project is consistent with that plan or action, then an EIR for such a project should not further analyze that cumulative impact as provided in Section 15183(j).

The area of cumulative effect associated with the FDCP is described as the FDCP Plan area, which encompasses the entire area (approximately 109 square miles) covered by the proposed FDCP. One major development is currently proposed within the Plan area: the proposed Forest Ranch project, a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning on 2,615± acres north and east of the community of Foresthill. The project site is located north and east of Foresthill Road, and is also crossed by Blackhawk Lane and Yankee Jim's Road. It is referred to in the FDCP as the "Pomfret Estate" property. The proposed project would be an amendment to the 1981 Foresthill General Plan, and would allow development of 2,213 residential units, of which 1,700 would be age-restricted; an 18-hole golf course and associated uses; a 100-unit recreational vehicle park; an equestrian center; professional offices; and open space (1,128± acres of the 2,615± acres).

The proposed Forest Ranch project is not consistent with the land use designations, zoning and standards proposed for that site in the FDCP. Under the FDCP, the project site would be designated for Development Reserve (1,300± acres); Forestry/160 acre minimum on most of the remainder of the site; and small areas designated Ag/Timberland (1 dwelling unit/160 acres) and Low Density Residential (1 dwelling unit/1 acre). The FDCP provides for a maximum of 533 dwelling units to be considered for the subject property, trails, golf course improvements, equestrian boarding stables and staging areas, mountain bike courses, fitness circuits and related facilities. It does not provide for a recreational vehicle park or professional office uses. If the Forest Ranch project is approved as proposed, it would add 1,680 dwelling units to the estimated total of 2,380 new dwelling units that could be developed under the proposed FDCP, as well as the recreational vehicle park and professional offices. It is anticipated that this would, at a minimum, result in a cumulative increase in impacts related to traffic, air quality, water quality, and public services and facilities. The impacts of the proposed Forest Ranch project are being evaluated in detail in an EIR being prepared concurrently with this EIR.

In accordance with Section 15130(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this EIR incorporates by reference the cumulative impacts analysis contained in the Placer County General Plan EIR.

Based on the identified region and the nature of the projects described above, Chapter Three of this EIR has identified the following significant cumulative impacts associated with the project and the region:

- **Loss of open space resulting from development in accordance with the FDCP (Impact 3.2-3).** Development of the Plan area in accordance with the proposed FDCP would allow

conversion of lands currently in undeveloped open space to residential, commercial, industrial or public uses. While the proposed FDCP will allow for less conversion of open space than the existing (1981) Foresthill General Plan, impacts must be measured in comparison to existing conditions rather than future planned uses. The majority of the Plan area is designated for Public Ownership (53%), Agricultural/Timberland (23%), and Forestry (12.4%). The remaining lands (less than 12%) are designated for Rural Residential (parcel sizes ranging from 2.3 acres to 10 acres), Low and Medium Density Residential, Industrial, Development Reserve, Mixed-Use Areas and Historic Outlying Commercial Areas. Portions of these areas are already developed, and the policies of the FDCP are designed to discourage “leapfrog” development and concentrate development within or near the Core Area of Foresthill. The FDCP includes policies to protect existing agricultural lands, forest and timber resources. Nevertheless, the loss of open space resources through conversion to developed uses represents a significant, cumulative impact of the proposed FDCP that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.

- **Introduction of new sources of light and glare within the Plan area (Impact 3.3-2).** As described in the “Setting” section above, the primary sources of light in the Plan area include headlights on the roadway system (particularly Foresthill Road), commercial development, and industrial facilities. A lighting district has been established in Foresthill, which is limited to the historic downtown area. Residential areas do not have street lights, but some individual residences have security lighting. The Placer County Rural Design Guidelines include a goal that encourages the minimization of artificial lighting on residences, other structures, and along roadways to limit the amount of light pollution. The Guidelines also recommend techniques designed to minimize light pollution. The proposed FDCP includes Policies 3.C.3-6, 3.C.5-1, and 3.C.2-3 related to lighting. Implementation Measure #29 for Natural Resources/Conservation/Open Space calls for adoption of a “dark sky” ordinance to protect important nighttime visual resources in the Plan area. Lighting is also addressed in the proposed Foresthill Community Design Guidelines. Compliance with the goals, policies, implementation measures and Design Guidelines will reduce the contribution of new development to substantial changes in the lighting environment, and improve some existing conditions. However, in comparison to existing conditions, additional development will contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on the ambient light conditions in the Plan area. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.
- **Conversion of timber lands to non-timber production use (Impact 3.6-2).** Coniferous forest represents the dominant vegetation community within the Plan area. The Plan area contains an interface between exclusive Placer County land use jurisdiction and the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service, which is responsible for managing land uses and timber resources in the Tahoe National Forest. Additionally, the California Department of Forestry (CDF) has regulatory authority over timber harvest activities on privately held timber land under the Z’Berg Nejedly Forest Practices Act of 1973. Since the Plan area lies within an area designated as Very High Fire Hazard Area, CDF is also actively engaged in fuel reduction programs to reduce the high levels of brush and timber fuel loading that contribute to wildland fire hazard in the area. The goals and policies of the proposed FDCP are designed to protect and preserve existing forest and timber resources. A majority of the Plan area is

designated for Public Ownership (53%), Agricultural/Timberland (23%) and Forestry (12.4%). Policy 4.A.6-2 calls for the County to discourage development that conflicts with timberland management and to protect significant timber production lands from incompatible development. Policy 4.A.6-8 requires the County to maintain a low mathematical density of allowable development in Forestry areas in order to protect major areas of potential timber resources on the Divide from conversion to other more intensive uses. Policy 4.A.6-9 calls for the County to encourage clustering of development in timberland areas within the Forest Residential land use designation to preserve timber resources for productive use, and Policy 4.A.6-10 encourages the use of the Timberland Production Zone for those lands which have significant commercial timber value. Finally, Policy 4.A.6-12 calls for the provision of public facilities and services to be limited in important timber areas on the Foresthill Divide. The proposed FDCP land use designations and zoning are designated to avoid conversion of productive timber lands to non-timber uses, and to allow other development to occur in a manner that does not conflict with timber-related uses. Nevertheless, the loss of productive or potentially productive timber resources through conversion of lands to developed uses represents a potentially significant cumulative impact of the proposed FDCP. No additional mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

- **Adverse impacts on water quality in the Plan area and downstream due to development in accordance with the proposed FDCP (Impact 3.6-7).** The greatest potential threat to water quality within the Plan area is contamination from individual sewage disposal systems. There are no community sewer systems located within the Plan area. All wastewater disposal is by individual systems (some of which serve more than one dwelling unit or business). The only community sewerage systems (i.e., community leach fields, oxidation ponds) are those serving mobile home parks, apartment complexes and multiple houses on one lot. Future growth will continue to be served by septic systems, unless required by Placer County Environmental Health Services to connect to a community sewer system. Sewer systems may be necessary for development of higher densities that generate high sewage flows or concentrate large quantities of sewage in limited areas.

The effectiveness of septic systems remains limited in some areas by shallow soils, massive granitic rock complexes, and excessive slopes that are characteristic of the Plan area. The FDCP provides that the flat region running through the center of the Plan area be served by individual sewage disposal systems on parcel sizes of 2.3 acres or more. Large areas northwest and southwest of this flat area “are marginal to unacceptable for the proper functioning of individual sewage disposal systems,” and sewage systems should be located on parcels ranging from 4.6 to 20 acres or larger. There are areas within the Plan area, however, that do not have shallow soils and are suitable for individual septic systems, such as Todd’s Valley. Other areas may be suitable with the use of engineered septic systems. Soil suitability for septic systems has been taken into consideration in development of the FDCP and the assignment of land use densities in residential, commercial and industrial areas.

Continued use of a community water system is recommended for higher density areas within the Plan area in order to minimize the risk of nitrate contamination in private wells. A significant portion of the Plan area is located outside the Foresthill PUD boundaries and other

water system service areas, and cannot feasibly be connected to a community water system. However, most of these areas are not considered suitable for development.

The proposed FDCP includes numerous policies that address water quality and wastewater disposal. Although these policies and implementation measures address water quality issues associated with on-site disposal systems, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (in their response to the Notice of Preparation, see Appendix A) has indicated that the County has inadequate design criteria for on-site domestic waste disposal systems. The Regional Board has found the Ordinance Governing Individual On-site Sewage Disposal Systems (Placer County Code, Chapter 4, Subchapter 1, Section 4.45) does not meet the Regional Board Guidelines for Waste Disposal From Land Development (Guidelines) and therefore poses a significant impact. This conclusion is also based on the Regional Board's statement that the FDCP policies have not been submitted to them for review as required under Resolution N o. 82-036 to waive Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for septic tank/leachfield systems for large developments. Given the County ordinance does not meet the Guidelines and no additional mitigation has been proposed, the Regional Board believes that the FDCP threatens to degrade water quality. The Regional Board suggests that high density residential discharges can be mitigated with the development of effective community collection, treatment and disposal systems.

Based on the Regional Board's comments, although the FDCP does not propose that large developments utilize individual on-site systems, this impact is considered a potentially significant cumulative impact. However, it can be mitigated to a level that is less than significant.

- **New stationary and mobile sources of air pollutants caused by buildout of the proposed FDCP, resulting in increased emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ (Impact 3.8-1).** Upon FDCP buildout, operation of new uses developed in accordance with the proposed Plan would cause increased emissions by generating new motor vehicle trips and by causing additional energy use and operation of other stationary sources of emissions. These are stationary- and area-source emissions that would be produced either directly in the Plan area, or indirectly through increased use of utilities located elsewhere. Motor vehicle use, energy use, and other stationary sources would cause emissions of ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ that would contribute to existing violations of state-level and/or federal ambient air quality standards. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP will assist in reducing emissions, development within the Plan area will contribute to regional emissions of these pollutants. Because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone and emissions will exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered significant and cumulative, and cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level.
- **Construction activities associated with development under the proposed FDCP, which will cause emissions of dust and contaminants from construction equipment exhaust that may contribute substantially to existing air quality violations or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Impact 3.8-2).** Construction activity often produces high levels of fugitive dust, including PM₁₀ particulate matter. Construction-related fugitive dust is generated primarily by grading activities and heavy equipment travel over temporary roads

on-site. Although the goals and policies of the FDCP and Placer County Air Pollution Control District Rules and Regulations will assist in reducing emissions, because the Plan area is currently within a nonattainment area for PM₁₀ and ozone, and emissions may at times exceed PCAPCD thresholds, impacts are considered potentially significant and cumulative, and may not always be mitigated to a less than significant level.

5.5 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides the following direction regarding analysis of growth-inducing impacts:

Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a wastewater treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

As presented in the “Setting” discussion in Section 3.1, Chapter Three, the estimated population of the Plan area for 2000 is 5,600. The population projection for 2010 is a range from 6,467 to 9,091, and the estimated maximum buildout population for the Plan area is 13,500. This is within the context of the population of Placer County, which was 243,646 in 2000, a projected 325,648 in 2010, and a projected 391,245 in 2020. The proposed FDCP represents a substantial reduction in the buildout population of the existing 1981 Foresthill General Plan, which was 28,000+ (for a Plan area approximately one-half the size).

Within the context of planned population growth in Placer County, population growth in the Plan area will not exceed regional population projections, and will not create substantial unplanned growth or concentration of people in the Plan area. As stated in the “Setting” discussion, Foresthill and other unincorporated areas will absorb a portion of the growth in Placer County, but geographical isolation, rugged terrain, and proactive community planning will slow growth to a rate that will not exceed buildout capacity. This was determined to be less than significant. Additionally, the FDCP does not propose to extend utilities in excess of those needed to serve the planned population. The Plan does not propose a community sewer system, and water service would be extended only to developments that are consistent with the proposed Plan. This potential growth-inducing impact is therefore considered less than significant.